"a digital multiplexer, connected to the digital compression device, for

multiplexing the video, graphics and audio signals, and the data codes into a

combined digital program stream."

Harper does not disclose or suggest such features.

While Harper, as shown in Figure 2, does disclose a system by which a plurality

cameras 104 capture the image of a teacher, Harper does not then create data commands to

link together the multiple video signals that are different predetermined views of the live

event (in this case a lecture). Instead, in Harper, various video feeds, "are input into the

Video Switch 108 which outputs one of the video signals" and the single video signal is then

compressed. (Col 15, lines 1-13) A plurality of audio responses are then linked to the single

video signal such that, "students at home or in separate classrooms can view the same video

on the display monitor(s) 186, but can carry on their own unique dialog with the interactive

program." (Col. 20, lines 13-16)

Harper does not disclose compressing multiple video signals or linking those

compressed signals using data commands. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable over Harper.

Similarly, claim 2 recites demultiplexing a combined digital program stream to reform

a first and second video signal and then seamlessly switching between the video signals.

Although the Examiner cites col. 30, lines 6-25, of Harper as disclosing these elements of

claim 2, Harper does not there, nor anywhere else, disclose or suggest linking multiple video

signals. As detailed above, Harper only discloses compressing and linking a single video

signal. Therefore, claim 2 is also allowable.

As with claim 1, claim 5 recites compressing multiple video signals and then

multiplexing the multiple video signals into a combined digital program stream. As detailed

above, Harper does not disclose or suggest compressing or multiplexing multiple video

signals. Therefore, claim 5 is also allowable over Harper.

Claims 3, 4, 6-9 and 11 depend from the allowable base claims 1, 2 and 5, and are

therefore allowable for at least the reasons above.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Harper. Applicants traverse the rejection. Claim 10 depends from allowable claim 5 and is therefore allowable for at least the reasons detailed above.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the outstanding rejections and pass this application to issue.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief, including extensions of time, and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. referencing 559442000113.

Dated: March 1, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
       Adam Keser
       Registration No. 54,217
       Morrison & Foerster LLP
       1650 Tysons Boulevard
       Suite 300
       McLean, Virginia 22102
       703-760-7301